DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 750 CS 504 762

AUTHOR Ross, Roseanna; DeWine, Sue
TITLE Interpersonal Needs and Communication in Conflict: Do Soft Words Win Hard Hearts?
PUB DATE Nov 84
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; College Students; *Communication Research; *Conflict Resolution; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; Leadership Styles; *Problem Solving; *Psychological Needs; Rating Scales

ABSTRACT

The relationship between interpersonal needs and communication in conflict management style messages was investigated in a study to discover the magnitude and direction of the relationship between three interpersonal needs--inclusion, control, and affection--and three styles of conflict management messages--focus on self, focus on issue, and focus on other. Undergraduate communication students (n=225) were administered a test booklet that contained the Conflict Management Message Style Instrument, three other conflict scales, and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior scale. A connonical correlation and followup correlations between subscales revealed the following: (1) a person who has a need to control others is self-focused in conflicts; (2) a person who has a high need for expressed affection tends to be focused on issue during conflict; (3) expressed inclusion is correlated with other focus; and (4) a person wanting others to control him or her is more concerned about the relationship in a conflict than about resolving the conflict itself. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED250750

INTERPERSONAL NEEDS AND COMMUNICATION IN CONFLICT: DO SOFT WORDS WIN HARD HEARTS?

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roseanna Ross

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Roseanna Ross

Assistant Professor
Communication Dept.
St. Cloud University
St. Cloud, Mn.
56301

Sue DeWine
Associate Professor
School of Interpersonal Communication
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Submitted to the Interpersonal Communication and Small Group Division of SCA, 1984.

CS 504 762

ABSTRACT

INTERPERSONAL NEEDS AND COMMUNICATION IN CONFLICT:
DO SOFT WORDS WIN HARD HEARTS?

This study develops futher validity tests on a new conflict management instrument (Conflict Management Message Style Instrument-CMMS) which identifies three conflict styles: focus on issue, focus on self, and focus on other. The researchers investigated the relationship between conflict management style and interpersonal needs (Schutz, 1966) of: inclusion, affection and control. A connonical correlation and follow up correlations between subscales lends support to the belief that a person who has a need to control others is self focused in conflicts, that a person who has a high need for expressed affection tends to be focused on issue during conflict, that expressed inclusion is correlated with other focus, and that a person wanting others to control him/her is more concerned for the relationship in a conflict than in resolving the conflict itself.

INTERPERSONAL NEEDS AND COMMUNICATION IN CONFLICT:

DO SOFT WORDS WIN HARD HEARTS?

Scott and Powers (1978) commented that "human communication and human needs are inextricably tied to each other" (p. 20), and emphasized the impact of interpersonal needs on communication and interpersonal relationships. The importance of human needs to human behavior is the foundation from which authors in the communication discipline have explored the interdependency of needs and the human communication transaction. (Knapp, 1978; Patton and Giffin, 1977; Scott and Powers, 1978) Knapp (1978) held that interpersonal needs influence the progress and maintenance of satisfactory relationships, as well as the deterioration of relationships. He stated that interpersonal needs not only "influence communication, [but are also] influenced by communication at various stages of the relationship" (p. 55). Needs-oriented theories of interpersonal communication are grounded in the research of W.C. Schutz (1966). Schutz contended that persons involve themselves in the creation of relationships and relational interaction based on the needs brought to the relationship, and identified these needs in three areas: inclusion, control, and affection.

At the same time that Schutz's interpersonal needs have been of interest to communication scholars, the

nature of conflict and its relation to communication have been the focus of recent scholars in speech and other communication-related fields (Ruben, 1978).

That communication theory and conflict theory are related has been reflected in the communication discipline for some time through texts solely devoted to this issue (Filley, 1975; Frost and Wilmot, 1978; Jandt, 1973; Miller and Simons, 1974), and the publication of a special issue of Speech Monographs dedicated to "Communication and Conflict" (Bowers, 1974). Ruben (1978) viewed conflict as "not only essential to the growth, change and evolution of living systems, but it is, as well, a system's primary defense against stagnation, detachment, entropy, and eventual extinction" (p. 206). In asserting that conflict is inevitable as relationships develop, Knapp described conflict as "neither good nor bad," but differentiated between the constructive and destructive communicative behaviors utilized in handling conflict (p. 162). One popular approach to directly observing communicative behavior, exhibited in conflict situations, has been identified by a number of authors as conflict management style or mode (Bell & Blakeney, 1977; Blake & Mouton, 1964; Filley, 1975; Hall, 1969; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Putnam, 1982; Ross, 1982; Ross & Dewine, 1982; Thomas & Kilmann, 1974). Putnam (1982) asserted that "conflict styles are actually communicative behaviors" (p. 1): each

conflict management style can be recognized through communicative acts. Frost and Wilmot (1978) contended that fuller understanding of the role of communication in interpersonal conflict can lead to a more constructive management of conflict.

Although scholars have focused individually on first, interpersonal needs and communication, and secondly, conflict management and communication, there has been little joint consideration of interpersonal needs and conflict management. This study is an investigation of the relationship between interpersonal needs and communication as manifested in conflict management style messages. The purpose of this study was to discover the magnitude and direction of the relationship between the three inter personal needs -- inclusion, control and affection--and the three styles of conflict management messages as identified by Ross and DeWine (1982)--focus on self, focus on issue, focus on other. Additionally, this research studied the relations between the set of interpersonal needs variables and the set of conflict management message variables. The significance of this study is developed through an examination of the theoretical relation of interpersonal needs to communication, communication to conflict management, and finally, the relation of interpersonal needs to conflict management.

Communication and Interpersonal Needs

Schutz (1966) commented that interpersonal needs "should be related to all situations in which the interpersonal element is significant" (p. 66), and implies that interpersonal needs are related to most important aspects of adult life. ". . . Virtually every choice made and opinion formed by an adult has to some degree the interpersonal element" (p. 67). Patton and Giffin (1977) credit Schutz's theory with the following:

> [Schutz's theory] establishes the groundwork for understanding the basis of relationship between people. From his theory we can infer that others respond to us within a framework of the role we indicate they should play in our interpersonal relationships. They can then make a choice to play that role or not to respond to us in the way that we intend . . . [Or] . . . they may initiate new communication concerning the role we have identified for them to play (pp. 208-209).

W.C. Schutz introduced the theory of interpersonal needs in 1958 in FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior (retitled in 1966, The Interpersonal Underworld), postulating that every individual has three interpersonal needs--inclusion, control, and affection--and the satisfaction of these needs is found in relationship with others. He described these needs as manifested and met through communicative behavior expressed toward, and received from, others.

In developing his theory of interpersonal needs orientation, Schutz designed seven FIRO scales: FIRO-B,

FIRO-F, LIPHE, MATE, VAL-ED, COPE AND FIRO-BC. The scale most appropriate to this study is the FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation--Behavior): a self-report questionnaire which measures a person's characteristic behavior toward other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. The primary purposes of the FIRO-B, according to the test manual (Schutz, 1978), are to provide: (a) a measure of how an individual characteristically relates to other people or acts in interpersonal situations, and (b) an instrument that will facilitate prediction of interaction between people. The FIRO-B attempts to quantify the three basic interpersonal needs on the two dimensions of expressed and wanted behavior. Of the FIRO scales, FIRO-B is the most extensively tested and utilized in systematic research, with rather complete validity/reliability data available for the instrument (Bloxom, 1972; Schutz, 1979).

Extensive research and publication has been generated by the FIRO theory since the inception of the theory in 1958, and responses on the FIRO-B have been correlated with scores on instruments measuring leader behavior, supervisor effectiveness, dyadic compatability, Machiavellianism, giving and receiving help, production of good ideas in brainstorming groups, effective listening, reticence in speech classes, and parent-child relationships (Arndt, 1968; Bouchard, 1969; Burke, Firth and McGratten, 1974;

Dimarco, Kuehl, and Wims, 1975; Gates, 1975; Hill, 1975; McDonough, 1966; Panepinto, 1970; Pflaumer, 1970; Rosenfeld and Frandsen, 1972). Only one reported study has attempted to investigate the relationship between needs and conflict management (Weart, 1972). The FIRO-B instrument was used in this study to investigate interpersonal needs.

Communication and Conflict Management Style

The role of communication in conflict is demonstrated by Doolittle (1976) in his comment that "conflict can only be manifested by or through some form of communicative behavior" (p. 2). Jandt and Hare (1976) hold the view that "for parties to be in conflict they must also be in communication" (p. 3). Blake and Mouton (1964) developed the theory out of which evolved the concept of conflict management style. In The Managerial Grid, they posited that a person's style or mode of handling conflict is based on a two dimensional framework: 1) the degree (high or low) of desire to meet personal ends or goals; and 2) the degree (high or low) of desire to maintain the relationship. Blake and Mouton (1964) referred to the five styles which evolve out of these two dimensions as follows: forcing (high concern for personal goal and low concern for relationship); confrontation (high concern for both personal goal and relationship); sharing (medium-range

concern for both the personal goal and the relationship); withdrawal (low concern for both personal goal and relationship); and smoothing (low concern for personal goal and high concern for relationship). Thomas (1976) more recently identified these five styles as competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating.

According to a number of authors, including Blake and Mouton (1964), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967a, 1967b), Hall (1969), Thomas and Kilmann (1974), Filley (1975), and Frost and Wilmot (1978), each person has a preferred approach to conflict, a characteristic style composed of these two goals--concern for the other (also referred to as relationship or cooperation), and concern for self (also referred to as personal concerns or assertiveness). The character of the style is determined by the importance of one goal in relation to the other. Most frequently, a person's style becomes habitual in the individual's attempts to deal with <u>all</u> conflicts, regardless of situation. Terhune (1968) notes: "Interpersonal behavior traits . . . may determine one's general style of relating to others so as to produce amity or enmity" (p. 2). Both Schutz (1966) in his needs theory, and Blake-Mouton (1964) in conflict management, note that out of a personal awareness an individual can begin behavior change, if he so wishes. Insofar as an awareness of this preferred conflict management style affords the person an opportunity to

choose conflict behaviors more flexibly, this can be an initial step in the successful management of a particular conflict.

Four self-report instruments for measuring these five conflict management styles have been developed in the past twenty years. As part of their managerial style orientation instrument, Blake and Mouton (1964) included five statements (each reflecting one style) to be ranked from "most typical" to "least typical" of self. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967b) utilized a subject's rating of the desirability of aphorisms representative of each of Blake and Mouton's conflict management styles (eg. . . "might overcomes right" as representative of the competitive style; "better half a loaf than no bread" as representative of the compromise style) to measure preferred conflict management style.

Hall (1973) developed a conflict management survey which considered the styles in four contexts: intrapersonal, interpersonal, intragroup, and intergroup. Each context was described and the subject was then asked to rank five statements (each statement reflective of one mode) on a ten point scale of "completely characteristic" to "completely uncharacteristic" of the subject's practices. Thomas and Kilmann developed the MODE (Management of Difference Exercise) Instrument (1974) as an ipsative, forced-choice measure, where sixty statements concerning communicative behavior in conflict (reflecting

the five styles) were paired in thirty distinct pairs. Subjects were directed to select the statement in each pair which best described their own response in interpersonal situations where their wishes differed from the wishes of another.

Although a number of studies have utilized these instruments designed to reflect the five styles, most recent research has challenged the validity of the five style approach, demonstrating, through factor analysis, the existence of only three identifiable styles. (Bell & Blakeney, 1977; Putnam, 1982; Putnam and Wilson, 1982; Ross, 1982; Ross & DeWine, 1982). These dimensions have been identified by Bell and Blakeney (1977) as forcing, confronting, and smoothing; by Putnam (1982) as control, solution-orientation, and nonconfrontation; by Ross and DeWine (1982) as focus on self, focus on issue, and focus on other. The five distinct conflict styles were not identifiable through factoring, yet the three factors which did emerge were similar in all three studies.

In addition, validity, reliability, and communication focus of the four earlier instruments have been questioned by numerous researchers (Bernardin & Alvares, 1976; Kilmann & Thomas, 1977; Putnam, 1982; Thomas & Kilmann, 1975, 1978; Ross, 1982; Ross & DeWine, 1982). As a result, Ross and DeWine (1982) have developed a valid and reliable instrument which not only reflects the three verifiable

styles of conflict management, but which also reflects a communication orientation through use of communication messages as items. The Ross-DeWine Conflict Management Message Style instrument is used in this study to identify conflict management style messages.

Interpersonal Needs and Conflict Management

A complete understanding of need and conflict theories (Schutz, 1966; Blake and Mouton, 1964) reveals a line of reasoning and development of issues which indicate a relationship between conflict behaviors and interpersonal needs. In Schutz's discussion of the communicative behaviors of the interpersonal types, profiles emerge which behaviorally seem similar to styles developed by Blake and Mouton (1964). Schutz's undersocial person, characterized by low expressed and low wanted inclusion needs, avoids associating with others and directs energies toward self preservation. Blake and Mouton described the avoiding style of conflict management as "low involvement with people and the contribution of minimum effort toward organization" (p. 85) . . . "not concerned with affection" (;. 86) . . . "isolates himself from both his boss and his subordinates" (p. 89) . . . "withdraws from situations of conflict where physical flight is possible" (p. 94). It would seem that both authors are suggesting similar

behaviors in describing two different variables.

In consideration of communication behaviors motivated by the need to express control, Schutz noted that "in an argument . . . the control seeker wants to be the winner" (p. 22) and projects control in the decision process. Blake and Mouton's development of the competitive style of conflict management noted that "direction and control are key managerial concepts" (p. 20), and persons using this style must "prove self right, other wrong;" this individual must get results "with little regard for the other as a person" (p. 33)

Schutz's need to express affection is projected in communicative behaviors directed to "close personal feelings between two people" (p. 23) with positive feelings being most important. Blake and Mouton's description of the accommodating style of conflict management points out that "disagreement, negative emotions, . . . are avoided. Positive, harmonious and accepting relationships are sought" (p. 66).

Other similarities become evident in considering the parallels between communicative behaviors evident in Schutz's explanation of the need to be controlled and Blake-Mouton's explanation of the avoiding style; between Schutz's need to be included as well as to receive affection, and Blake-Mouton's accommodating style. Finally, Schutz's description of communicative behaviors of

persons with moderate levels of the three needs indicates a type who would utilize Blake-Mouton's collaborating conflict style--able to express and want inclusion, control, and affection when the situation demands. Blake and Mouton noted that persons using the collaborative style in conflict communicate in ways encouraging "interdependence as well as independence" (p. 163).

In one study by Weart (1972) the relationship between needs and conflict management styles was explored. The subjects included 25 principals and 125 classroom teachers who were asked to recall interpersonal conflicts, and to then choose the one which they managed in a way they considered most satisfying. With this frame of reference, they were next to choose from five descriptions of different conflict management styles the one most closely describing the technique used in that satisfying situation they recalled. The percentage of subjects in each need category, who indicated using each conflict style, was reported.

Although limited in scope, this descriptive approach is a basic step in looking at the question of the relation ship between conflict management style and interpersonal needs. Weart found what he interpreted as <u>moderate</u> differences in choice of preferred conflict management style among teachers and principals on the basis of expressed inclusion scores, expressed control scores,

expressed affection scores, and wanted affection scores; he found weak differences in choice of preferred conflict management style among respondents on the basis of the wanted inclusion scores and wanted control scores. Statistical significance of the results was not testable within the limits of Weart's approach to the data.

The current study addressed the relationship between interpersonal needs and conflict management message style. The hypothesis tested in this study was: H_1 degrees of perceived interpersonal needs will be significantly correlated with perceptions of conflict management style. It is expected that affection needs will positively correlate with "other" conflict orientation, and that control needs will correlate positively with "self" conflict orientation.

Instrumentation

Conflict Style

The Ross-DeWine Conflict Management Message Style Instrument, (1983) identified three message types used in conflict management through factor analysis--messages which focus on self, messages which focus on issue, and messages which focus on other. The test is composed of 18 message

items, six message items reflecting each of the three styles. Each item uses a 1 - 5 Likert-type scale from "never say things like this" to "usually say things like this." The test is preceded by an instructions page directing subjects to recall and write about their most common behavior in conflict. This is designed to make subjects' responses more situationally specific. A respondent can receive a score ranging from 6 to 30 on each of the three subscales.

A message with focus on self reflects emphasis on the speaker's personal interests. A self focus message item is: "You can't do (say) that to me-- it's either my way or forget it!"

A message which focuses on issue maintains that the problem can be solved without jeapardizing the relation ship, and emphasizes that both parties deal with the problem. An issue focus message item is: "This is some thing we have to work out; we're always arguing about it."

A message which focuses on other considers neither the problem nor personal interests, but emphasizes forgetting the problem and and keeping the other party happy. Another focus message item is: "That's O.K. . . . it wasn't important anyway . . . You feeling O.K. now?"

Coefficient Alphas was computed for each subscale: self .764; issue .782; and other .730. On the total instrument Alpha was .644. Test-retest correlations were

also significant at $p < .01$: self .690; issue .647; other .627; and total .394.

As operationalized by Schutz in developing the FIRO-B, there are three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. These needs are manifested and met through communicative behaviors expressed toward, and received from, others. Interpersonal needs are identified by a subject's six scores on the FIRO-B--expressed and wanted inclusion, expressed and wanted affection, expressed and wanted control. Each of the six scales has nine items (54 multiple choice items total) and was developed with the use of Guttman scaling techniques. Answer alternatives are of the two types: for 24 items the responses are made on a six step continuum from "nobody" to "most people;" the remaining questions require responses on a six step continuum from "never" to "usually."

Inclusion (I) refers to the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to interaction and association--the need to be included in other's activities, to be with people as much as possible, or to include others in one's own activities (Schutz, 1966). Inclusion is analogous to introversion-extroversion or sociability, and is manifested in two directions--inclusive behaviors expressed toward others, and the behaviors of being included which the individual wants others to express toward self.

Control (C) refers to the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to control and power--the need to five and receive structure, directions, influence, power and authority (Schutz, 1966). Control is analogous to authoritarianism or need for power and is manifested in two directions--control behavior expressed towards others, and the desire for others to express control behaviors toward self.

Affection (A) refers to the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with another person with respect to love and affection--emotional closeness to others, friendship, liking, the need to act in a personal way toward others or to receive friendly behavior from others. Affection is analogous to the need for affiliation and is manifested in two directions--affection behaviors expressed toward others, and the desire for others to express affection behaviors toward self.

Procedures & Analysis

225 volunteer undergraduate students were recruited from introductory communication classes at two midwestern universities. Subjects were asked to complete a test booklet which contained the CMMS, three other conflict scales, and the FIRO-B. Construct validity of the CMMS was addressed by correlating individuals' responses to the CMMS

with theoretically similar constructs. CMMS scores were predicted to be more positively correlated with Putnam's OCCI (1982) conflict scale than with Bell and Blakeney's (1977) revision of Lawrence and Lursch's (1967) conflict instrument or Hall's (1973) conflict instrument. Because Hall's instrument focuses on attitudes about conflict across a variety of settings (groups, organization-wide and dyads) we only used the subscale dealing with interpersonal relationships. Putnam's scale does not use communication messages however it does place conflict management style within the construct of communication behavior thus we felt it would be most similar to the CMMS, Hall's instrument is attitudinal and Bell and Blakeney measure conflict style by asking subjects to identify aphorisms similar to their attitudes. The CMMS, along with these three conflict instruments, was administered with the FIRO-B instrument in alternate orders to control for order effects and the potential damage of the fatigue factor. Correlations among the conflict instruments were: CMMS with OCCI $r=.52$, p .001; CMMS with Bell and Blakeney, $r=.36$, $p < .001$; CMMS with Hall $r=.24$, $p < .05$. Subscale correlations are reported in Table 1.

Additionally a group of 106 students were asked to complete the CCMS instrument and to give a revised version of the instrument to a best friend or relative to test for concurrent validity. This form was adjusted so that the

friend/relative (other person) respondent was to note items in terms of messages said by the student subject and hear by the friend or relative. Correlation coefficients for all three subscales were significant: self =.351, $p < .01$; issue = .340, $p < .01$; other =.194, $p < .05$.

A connonical correlation analysis was computed to address the question of the relationship between the two sets of variables: interpersonal needs and conflict management message styles. The connonical correlation method is a powerful method for analyzing the relationship between the two variable sets (Tucker & Chase, 1976; Williams, 1979). Tucker and Chase suggest a minimum ratio of 20 subjects per variable. The present pool of 225 subjects for nine variables meets this criterion.

The results of the cononical correlation are in Table 2. Two cononical variates were significant ($p < .01$). The first variate accounted for 52% of the variance while the second variate accounted for 32% of the variance. The first variate seemed to be dominated by the interpersonal needs of expressed affection, expressed inclusion, a negative correlation with wanted affection, and the conflict focus on issue. The second variate is dominated by the interpersonal needs of expressed control and wanted control and the conflict focus on self with focus on issue. also moderately highly correlated. Individual correlations between the subscales of the two constructs were computed

with the following results; expressed inclusion correlated with other, $r=.19$, $p < .05$; wanted control with other, $r=.23$, $p < .01$; expressed control with self, $r=.29$, $p < .001$; and expressed affection with issue, $r=.28$, $p < .01$.

Discussion

In an earlier study (Ross and DeWine, 1982) the Conflict Management Message Style Instrument was developed and tested. In the current study, further testing of that instrument's validity was completed. The instrument was highly correlated to the Putnam conflict instrument, the only communication orientated instrument used. Correlations with two other conflict instruments resulted in lower correlations as predicted. These instruments were not communication orientated but were attitude scales about conflict. For example, the Bell and Blakeney instrument asks subjects to select aphorisms that "describe their typical way of handling conflict", i.e., "Kill your enemies with kindness" or "Might overcomes right". The Hall instrument instructs subjects to rank order statements according to the following situation: "When you are the one with power greater than that of the other person, how are you inclined to handle the situation?". A sample statement include: "I encourage the other party to express himself fully-what he thinks and how he feels-and then I

let him know I can appreciate all that and try to show him where he is wrong." The Putnam instrument lists general descriptions of inter actions and asks subjects to rate each item according to how likely they are to exhibit that behavior. Statements include: "I insist my position be accepted during an argument" or "I shy away from topics which are sources of dispute for the other person." Finally, the Ross-DeWine CMMS lists communication messages and asks subjects to indicate how likely it is that they might actually say something like that in a conflict situation. Statements include: "Shut up! You're Wrong! I don't want to hear any more of what you have to say" or "That's O.K. . . . it wasn't important anyway . . . you feeling O.K. now?" Consequently, the CMMS appears to be assessing the conflict construct with a communication focus on actual messages which is lacking in other available instruments. The subscales of these instruments correlate significantly in expected directions. Additionally, significant but modest correlations were found between subjects perceptions of their behavior and a good friend's perception of messages used during conflict.

There does appear to be a relationship between individuals' interpersonal needs and the way in which they handle conflict situations. Schutz noted that the person who seeks to control others wants to be a "winner". Blake and Mouton's description of the competitive style of

conflict management suggests that direction and control are key characteristics. The high correlation between expressed control and the self conflict orientation on the CMMS provide support for this relationship between the need to control and the "winning" a conflict interaction.

Secondly, Schutz describes the need to express affection as a need for close personal feelings between two people. Blake and Mouton's description of the accommodating style of conflict management suggests a person who avoids negative emotions of any kind and instead seeks positive, harmonious and accepting relationships. The significantly high correlation between expressed affection and the issue conflict orientation in the current study reinforce the belief that this relationship exists.

Two other correlations were significant: expressed inclusion with other and wanted control with other. The person who has a high need for inclusion needs to be included in other's activities as much as possible and to be with people frequently in order to establish satisfactory relationships. The person who is other orientated during a conflict situation maintains that the relationship is most important and emphasizes that both parties must feel comfortable with each other. It seems reasonable to expect that a person who is more concerned about the relationship than solving the problem will express inclusive behavior toward the other.

The final significant correlation was between a need to be controlled by others and a focus on other in conflict resolution. This seems to be parallel to the previous discussion. A person who is most concerned about the "other" is likely to also desire controlling behaviors from others as well.

Human communication behaviors in conflict situations seem tied to human needs. The kinds of behaviors individuals express toward others and desire to have others express toward them will affect the types of messages used to resolve conflict. Schutz claims that these interpersonal needs are related to virtually every choice made and opinion formed by an adult in interpersonal interactions. The present study supports the conclusion that these needs are at least manifested through the use of various communicative messages in conflict situations. Our choice of messages is affected by our desire to fulfill various interpersonal needs. Whether or not these needs also affect other communication choices remains to be tested.

Table 2

Canonical Correlation Between Interpersonal Needs and Conflict Management Style

	Root 1 loadings	Root 2 loadings	Root 3 loadings
Conflict- Self focus	-.316	.771	.606
Conflict- Other focus	.373	-.273	.912
Conflict- Issue focus	.873	.415	-.285
Wanted Inclusion	-.404	.118	-.064
Expressed Inclusion	.636	.023	-.218
Wanted Control	.400	.518	.305
Expressed Control	-.003	.826	.564
Wanted Affection	-.736	-.231	.068
Expressed Affection	.724	-.341	.720
Eigenvolve	.227	.138	.072
Rc	.430	.348	.260
Wilks Lambda	.667	.818	.932
F	2.80	2.42	2.09
Probability	.001	.01	.082
Percent of variance	52%	32%	17%

Table 1

Correlations Between CMMS Subscales
And Other Conflict Scales

	OCCI			Bell & Blankney			Hall		
	Control	Solution	Nonconforming	Force	Confront	Smooth	Competing	Accommodating	Collaborating
Self	r=.44 p < .001	NS	NS	r=.35 p < .001	NS	r=-.17 p < .05	NS	NS	NS
Issue	NS	r=.47 p < .001	r=-.33 p < .001	NS	r=.46 p < .001	NS	NS	NS	NS
Other	NS	NS	r=.35 p < .001	NS	NS	r=.26 p < .01	NS	NS	r=-.187 p < .05

REFERENCES

Arndt, G. M. An investigation of the influence of interpersonal compatibility on counselor and counseler perceptions of the initial interviews. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968.

Bell, E., & Blakeney, R. Personality correlates of conflict resolution modes. Human Relations, 1977, 30, 849-857.

Bernardin, H.J., & Alvaries, K. The managerial guide as a predictor of conflict resolution method and managerial effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 84-92.

Blake, R., & Mouton, J. The managerial grid: Key orientations for achieving production through people. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

Bloxom, B. Critical review of FIRO-B. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Bouchard, T.J. Personality, problem-solving procedure and performance in small groups. Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, 1969, 53, 1-29.

Bowers, J.W. (ed.). Communication and conflict; symposium. Speech Monographs, 1974, 41, 1-84.

Burke, R., Firth, J., & McGrattan, C. Husband-wife compatibility and the management of stress. Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 94, 2.

DiMarco, N., Kuehl, C., & Wims, E. Leadership style and interpersonal need orientation as moderators of changes in leadership dimension scores. Personnel Psychology, 1975 28, 2.

Doolittle, R.J. Orientations to communication and conflict. In R. Applbaum and R. Hart (Eds.), MODCOM Modules in speech communication. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976.

Filley, A.C. Interpersonal conflict resolution. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1975.

Frost, J.H., & Wilmot, W. Interpersonal Conflict. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., Publishers, 1978.

Gates, S. Some self-concept characteristics of the male Machiavellian personality style (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 3038 B. (University Microfilms No. 75-26, 714).

Hall, J. Conflict management survey: A survey on one's characteristic reaction to and handling of conflicts between himself and others. Conroe. Texas: Teleometrics International, 1969.

Hall, J. How to interpret your scores from the conflict management survey. Conroe, Texas: Teleometrics International, 1973.

Hall, J. Personality and mode preference: a multimodal view of conflict management. Unpublished manuscript, Teleometrics International, 1974

Hill, R.E. Interpersonal compatibility and work group performance. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1975, 11, 210-219.

Jandt, F. (Ed.). Conflict resolution through communication. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Jandt, F.E., & Hare, M. Instruction in conflict resolution. Urbana: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1976.

Kilmann, R., & Thomas, K. Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The "MODE" instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1977, 37, 309-325.

Kilmann, R., & Thomas, K. Interpersonal conflict handling behavior as reflections of Jungian personality dimensions. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 971-980.

Knapp, M. L. Social Intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Lawrence, P.R., & Lorsch, J.W. Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1967, 12, 1-47. (a)

Lawrence, P.R., & Lorsch, J.W. Organization and environment. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1967. (b)

McDonough, John. Hierarchically grouped social and need factors as a means of determining dyadic compatability (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts, 1967 27, 4130 B. (University Microfilms, No. 67-5460.

Miller, G., & Simons, H. (Eds.). Perspectives on communication and conflict. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Panepinto, J.V. The interpersonal style of parents and their children (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 3001 B. (University Microfilms No. 70-22, 616).

Patton, B.R., & Giffin, K. Interpersonal communication in action (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1977.

Pflaumer, E.M. Personality correlates of effective listening (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 3686A. (University Microfilms No. 70-26, 349).

Putnam L. Communicative strategies in organizational conflicts: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Boston, May 1982.

Putnam, L. & Wilson, C. Communicative strategies in organizational conflicts: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon, Communication Yearbook 6, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982.

Rosenfeld, L., & Frandsen, K. The "other" speech student" An empirical analysis of some interpersonal relations orientations of the reticent student. The Speech Teacher, 1972, 21, 4.

Ross, R. G. The development and evaluation of a self-report instrument to measure conflict management style (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, 43. (University Microfilm no. 82-83, 277).

Ross, R. & DeWine, S. Interpersonal Conflict measurement: Development and validation. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Louisville, Kentucky, November 1982.

Ruben, B. D. Communication and conflict: A system - theoretic perspective. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1978, 64, 202-210.

Schutz, W. C. The interpersonal underworld: A reprint edition of FIRO. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1966.

Schutz, W. C. FIRO awareness scales manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978.

Scott, M. D., & Powers, W. G. Interpersonal communication: A question of needs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin company, 1978.

Terhune, K. Motives, situations, and interpersonal conflict within prisoner's dilemma. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement, March 1968, 8, #3, part 2, 1-24.

Terhune, K. The effects of personality in cooperation and conflict. In P. Swingle (Ed.), The structure of conflict. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Thomas, K. W. Conflict and conflict management. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Thomas, K., & Kilmann, R. Comparison of four instruments measuring conflict behavior. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 1139-1145.

Thomas, K., & Kilmann, R. The social desirability variable in organizational research, an alternative explanation for reported findings. Academy of Management Journal, December 1975, 18, 741-752.

Thomas, K., & Kilmann, R. Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Code Instrument. Tuxedo, New York: Xicom, Inc., 1974.

Tucker, R., & Chase, L. Canonical Correlation in human communication research. Human Communication Research, Fall 1976, 3, 86-96.

Weart, D. N. The relationship of teachers' and principals' interpersonal relations orientations and preferences for conflict management techniques (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 3233 A. (University Microfilm No. 72-28, 815).

Williams, F. Reasoning with Statistics (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston Publishers, 1979.